

Kaptelinin

Amendment E

JAN 21 2009

Page 19 of 20

As per claims 7 and 26: The labels shown by Estrada do not constitute a clear ranking scale. It is not certain, for instance, whether "My thoughts" have a higher priority than "A few adjustments".

As per claim 18: Applicant respectfully submits that Estrada's "out-of-sync" does not mean "project becomes inactive" (cf. OA, p. 14, lines 18-19). It means that some changes in the collaborative workspace have not been adequately replicated in some participants' workspaces. Estrada's auto-updating changes project spaces of such participants by automatically receiving and adding recent resources, which may mean that a project space for such a participant is NOT the same as before a break. Estrada is clear that synchronization means *changing* a participant's workspace (e.g., [0044]).

AS PER CLAIMS 28-34. OA states that "Claims 28-34 recite an apparatus for performing a similar method as discussed in claims 1-27 and are rejected for the same reasons" (OA, p. 13, lines 4-5). Due to the absence of additional OA's arguments regarding claims 28-34, applicant cannot provide additional counterarguments, compared to those already presented as per claims 1-27. Applicant would be happy to address any further comments, if they are provided.

2. Response to arguments

Applicant have fully considered OA's "Response to arguments" section (OA, pp. 13-15) and revised his arguments accordingly.

At the same time, however, Applicant respectfully submits that his arguments, provided in Amendment D, filed on July 18, 2008, have not been fully considered. In particular, very central arguments, presented in section 2 (pages 11-12) and section 3.1.2 (pages 14-15) of Amendment D, filed on July 18, 2008, are not mentioned in the OA.

Very respectfully, Applicant insists that his arguments, especially those submitted in section 3.1 of this document, be fully and properly considered.

Kaptelinin

Amendment E

Page 20 of 20

4. Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore he submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

5. Conditional request for constructive assistance

Applicant has amended the claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure, which is also unobvious. If, for any reason, this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to MPEP § 706.03(d) and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,



Viktor Kaptelinin

Applicant Pro Se

Mariehemsv. 13A
906 54 Umeå, Sweden
Tel. +46-90-786 5927
Fax +46-90-786 6550

Certificate of mailing: I certify that on the date below I will fax this document and references attachments, if any, to the Patent and Trademark Office at the following number: **(571) 273-8300**

Date: January 21, 2009

Inventor's signature: 